



*JP*

*TFW*

*2134*

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*10/000,173*

In re: the Patent Application of

Khiem LE

Examiner: Christopher J. Brown

U.S. Serial No.: 10/<sup>000</sup>~~400~~,173

Art Unit: 2134

Date Filed: November 30, 2001

Docket No.: NC17216(NOK113-17216)

For: Apparatus and Associated Method, for Facilitating Authentication of a Mobile Station with a Core Network

Commissioner of Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in the envelope addressed to:

Commissioner of Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on June 23, 2006.

*Adrienne Shirley*

Adrienne Shirley

REQUEST FOR COMPLETE OFFICE ACTION

Sir:

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action dated April 4, 2006 is incomplete and requests that a corrected or supplemented Office Action be mailed. As background, in response to the 1st Office Action dated June 16, 2005, applicant filed an Amendment and Response on December 20, 2005. In the Amendment, claims were amended, claims cancelled, and several arguments presented for patentability. The current Office Action fails to completely and correctly reply to all of applicant's arguments and includes an obviousness rejection that is directed to the original claims rather than to the currently pending, amended, claims.

"Selected Authenticator" feature

In the paragraph bridging pages 10 and 11 of the Amendment and Response, and the first full paragraph on page 11 of that Response, applicant distinguished the claimed invention over

Malkin by indicating that authentication of the mobile station according to the invention as then claimed was effected via the interaction of a mobile station with a "selected authenticator." This argument is not addressed or responded to in the Office Action. The Office Action does not address either the "selected authenticator" feature or applicant's discussion in the first full paragraph on page 11. It is respectfully requested that the aforementioned argument be addressed to provide applicant with a complete and clear Action in order to advance the prosecution of the application. Where a requirement is traversed, the Examiner should make proper reference thereto and, in an Action on the Amendment, take note of applicant's arguments and answer the substance of same. MPEP §707.07(f).

Additionally, it is noted that the obviousness rejection in the current Office Action addresses the original claims rather than the currently pending amended claims. Indeed, the obviousness rejection on pages 4-6 repeats verbatim the obviousness rejection of the original claims in the 1st Office Action, including cancelled claims 6 and 18.

In view of the above, applicant respectfully requests that the current Office Action be corrected or supplement and that the period for applicant's response be adjusted according to the mailing date of the corrected or supplemented Office Action. MPEP §710.06.

*Applicant hereby petitions that any and all extensions of time of the term necessary to render this response timely be granted. COSTS FOR SUCH EXTENSION(S) AND/OR ANY OTHER FEE DUE WITH THIS FEE DUE WITH THIS PAPER THAT ARE NOT FULLY COVERED BY AN ENCLOSED CHECK MAY BE CHARGED TO DEPOSIT ACCOUNT #10-0100.*

**Date: June 23, 2006**

Lackebach Siegel LLP  
One Chase Road  
Scarsdale, NY 10583  
Telephone: 914 723 4300  
MG/as

**Respectfully submitted,**

LACKENBACH SIEGEL LLP  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)  
Customer No. 43829

By: Robert M. Sawyer, Reg. No. 34,467  
MYRON GREENSPAN, Reg. No. 25,680 for